

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

Mass.:
COMMISSION ON PROBATION

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1927



BOSTON

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

1,000 12-'28 Order 4224

COMMISSION ON PROBATION

MASS. OFFICIALS

BENJAMIN LORING YOUNG, *Chairman*

MISS MARY E. DRISCOLL

ROBERT E. GOODWIN

ARTHUR P. STONE

DANIEL J. LYNE

HERBERT C. PARSONS, *Deputy Commissioner and Secretary*

Office, 175 Court House, Pemberton Square, Boston

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Report of the Commission on Probation | 3 |
| Report of the Deputy Commissioner | 4 |
| Sustained Use of Probation | 4 |
| Relation to Other Dispositions | 4 |
| Size of Probation "Population" | 5 |
| Not Limited to Misdemeanors | 5 |
| Superior Court Development | 5 |
| Variation in Use of Probation | 6 |
| The Courts' Varying Estimate of Probation | 6 |
| Results in Probation Cases | 7 |
| Offences as to Which Probation is Used | 7 |
| Collections and Cost | 8 |
| Bureau of Records | 8 |
| Half Century of Probation | 8 |
| Qualifications for the Service | 9 |
| Probation Conferences | 9 |
| New Members of the Commission | 10 |

STATISTICAL TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Cases Placed on Probation: Table 1 | 11 |
| Summary of Probation Cases in All Courts: Table 1 | 12 |
| Cases Placed on Probation — Age Distribution: Table 2 | 12 |
| Results of Probation: Table 3 | 13 |
| Summary of Probation Results in All Courts: Table 4 | 14 |
| Probation by Offences: Table 5 | 14 |
| Probation Population: Table 6 | 17 |
| Comparative Dispositions: Table 7 | 19 |
| Releases by Probation Officers: Table 8 | 22 |
| Collections by Probation Officers: Table 9 | 23 |
| Cost of Probation Service: Table 10 | 25 |

364113
C732
1927
B

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PROBATION

To His Excellency, The Governor, and the General Court:

The Commission on Probation respectfully submit its nineteenth annual report.

No statistical statement, however complete, could give an adequate idea of the relative importance of probation in the administration of justice. It could only serve to reassure the public that probation has an important and permanent place in our judicial system. That probation deserves its position of importance is proved by the facts. The courts, after years of experience, rely upon it more and more. It succeeds in a large proportion of cases in which it is invoked. Most important, it helps produce the desired result, namely a relatively low crime rate, such as Massachusetts today enjoys. The reformation of the individual is incidental to the main purpose of our criminal jurisprudence, the protection of the community from crime.

The Commission on Probation is charged with the general supervision of the probation service, being itself a part of the Commonwealth's judicial system. Its duties are largely advisory but it has certain administrative duties. These are performed through its executive officer, whose title in the statutes is deputy commissioner. The title is unfortunate in that the impression is created that he is subordinate to some other single official, when in fact he is the chief executive of the entire work of the Commission. The suggestion has been made that a new title should be provided for the executive more closely in harmony with the importance of his work, but no recommendation is made on this subject at the present time.

The Commission does not ask for any increase of its own authority under the statutes. The Commission is concerned for the present merely to use its statutory powers towards the best service which can be obtained. The intimate relationship between the Commission and the courts which now exists is the main reliance of the Commission in performing its duty. The readiness of the judges to respond to helpful suggestion is of the highest value and is greatly appreciated.

The authority of the Commission to require reports from probation officers has been exercised to the fullest extent. This has resulted in a clearing-house of criminal records embracing all the information obtainable from all the courts in criminal cases. The bureau of information in the office of the Commission has become indispensable to the work of the courts. It is utilized also by public departments such as the police, licensing boards, the civil service commission and in connection with the investigation of persons for jury duty and for admission to the bar. It has also been of value to the Federal authorities in connection with naturalization of aliens. The information contained in the files of the Commission is in the highest degree confidential and its privacy is strictly guarded in the public interest.

With the close of this year Massachusetts will have had fifty years of probation in its criminal courts. The pioneer work of Massachusetts in the science of probation has given to our Commonwealth a distinctive place not only among our own state governments, but among foreign nations as well. This anniversary is an event of such significance as to deserve adequate recognition.

The report of Herbert C. Parsons, deputy commissioner, contains a full discussion of questions relating both to policy and methods. We ask that it be given careful attention and we desire to take this opportunity of expressing our high appreciation of the services of Mr. Parsons. A recognized expert

in probation, a man of wide experience both with public affairs and journalism, his work as deputy commissioner has brought to the Commonwealth a position of leadership in this field of government.

Respectfully submitted.

B. LORING YOUNG, *Chairman*

MARY E. DRISCOLL
ARTHUR P. STONE

ROBERT E. GOODWIN
DANIEL J. LYNE
Commission

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

To the Honorable Commission on Probation:

I have the honor to present the nineteenth annual report of the deputy commissioner, covering the period of the year ending September 30, 1927.

Sustained Use of Probation

In the past few years it has not been possible to note striking changes in the use of probation or in its results in Massachusetts practice. Through periods of general public unconcern as to corrections and through seasons of excited interest the place of probation has been little affected. In the former, it advanced steadily and unsensationally as the courts developed the use of this modern instrumentality. In the latter, it had to meet no direct attack upon its fundamentals and it successfully resisted proposals in legislation that would have limited its applications. In both, there has been given to probation the final evidence of its arrival at a trusted and a permanent standing.

The year just closed substantiates the claim for the general and final acceptance of the idea that probation represents. If it is necessary to restate that idea, it may be described as the theory that the courts could select from the flood of offenders with which they are called upon to deal some portion worthy of test, as to their behavior, without immediate infliction of classical penalties, and retain its control over them for a period of time, exercising supervision by their own chosen officials.

Through familiarity with the exercise of this power by the courts we have ceased to sense what a radical departure it marked from the tradition that the courts could try cases and condemn to penalties but might not exercise the administrative function of discipline or reformation. It is still unfamiliar in many of our states, although winning a varying recognition in the laws of nearly all of them. But in our Commonwealth it has come to be interwoven in the fabric of our social legislation, has been affirmed and reaffirmed in interpretation of law by the supreme judicial court, and has been demonstrated in the practice of every trial court. Such a situation gives opportunity, in reports upon its operation, to make note of passing developments, incidental rather than fundamental, and to point out the improvements in application and particularly in administration, which are possible and which call for continued effort.

Hence, it is not startling, indeed hardly noteworthy, that the courts placed 31,368 persons on probation in 1927. For several years the number has hovered around thirty thousand. This year it is slightly larger than in 1926, when it was 30,934—a gain of 434. It represents the largest number in any year save two, when it rose to 32,000 and 33,000 but kept almost the same ratio to the total number of court dispositions. It is this proportion to the entire number of convictions which is significant, and this has varied slightly for a series of years.

Relation to Other Dispositions

Out of 1,000 convicted offenders the number placed on probation during this year was 224. In 1926, it was 227. In no year has it risen above 236. This is a striking demonstration of stability and such a one as has not been shown by any other of the several dispositions possible to the courts. The

rising tide of motor-law offences, overwhelmingly disposed of by fines, has tended strongly to keep down the percentage of probation. This year, out of the average 1,000, fines were imposed in 452 cases, even a larger number than in 1926, when it was 442; while 245 cases were closed by "filing" without any penalty.

With 697 out of 1,000 cases ended summarily by fining or filing, the 303 in which the court deals with the person were divided by placing 224 on probation and sentencing 79 to institutions. The year further marks decline in commitments from 94 out of the 1,000 convicted in 1925, to 84 in 1926 and to 79 at present. The probation proportion just misses being exactly three times as large as that of commitments. Even this impressive demonstration is not far different from that of other years. It would be, however, more striking if there were added the several thousand of cases in which probation is exercised informally without court record through reference of complaints to probation officers, a practice which is widespread in domestic relations and juvenile cases, although varying widely among the courts.

Size of Probation "Population"

Another evidence of uniformity in the use of probation is the number of cases carried by the officers. At the end of this year the number remaining on probation was 19,735. The year before it was 19,702. Within this number certain progressive changes may be noted. The slightly declining number of juvenile probationers, year by year, marks the reduction in the total of juvenile delinquency which reaches the courts, amounting in recent years to a decline of nearly a third.

Probation began and has remained as much an adult as a juvenile process. This year the "probation population" stood on September 30—juvenile, 3,166; adult, 16,569. Among the adult, there has been a constantly increasing proportion of women on probation, the number this year being 2,100, about 9 per cent larger than in 1926. Of the adults placed on probation about 9 per cent are women; of the adult probation "population" about 12 per cent are women, indicating that women are carried for longer terms. This proportion of women on probation gives no indication of the extent to which they are involved in the problems of the service. Intelligent application takes into account the fact that in the entire domestic relations field the interest of women, the wives and mothers, married and unmarried, is the major factor, although the male defendant,—deserter, non-supporter, adjudged father,—is the one who solely and numerous appears in the statistics.

Not Limited to Misdemeanors

The present era is one of severe sentences for serious offences. This characteristic is affirmed by the familiar evidence of the day's news. It is having its visible effect in the increased population of the state prison and other state, as compared to the county, institutions. It would be easy to form the notion that probation was being relegated to the field of misdemeanors. The facts are otherwise.

The largest proportional gain in the number of cases placed on probation is in the superior courts. While the increase for all courts was but a fraction over one per cent, for the superior courts the increase was 12 per cent. This is in the quarter where the serious crimes are considered. It reflects in a distinct measure the confidence in the process by the judges with the more taxing problems on their hands, but it also reflects another fact of the highest significance in the whole situation, namely the relation between efficiency in the system and the extent to which it is employed.

Superior Court Development

Nothing in relation to the probation service has been more marked in the past decade or so than its improvement in the Superior courts. In every county in the state the probation office of the higher courts has taken on a new character. The personnel, so far as the number of officers is concerned,

has not greatly changed, not more than keeping pace with the number of cases given them, but in point of skillfulness, activity and method there has been great advance. The situation has been helped by the development of clerical staffs. The first clerk in a Superior Court probation office was appointed in 1914, one clerk in the Suffolk county office. With a single exception every such office in the state now has clerical assistance.

The officers, who carry a serious responsibility, have thus been measurably freed from clerical absorption of their time and enabled to attend to their important duties. Record systems, carefully studied with a view to value and freedom from needless elaboration, have replaced random and transient notes sparingly kept by officers who had a mistaken pride in their memories. In place of occasional requirements for a record of previous convictions of a convicted person whose case supplied the court with an unusual perplexity, there has come the routine dependence upon the probation officer's investigation of all cases.

The type of justice of the superior court who formerly stood out as the user and champion of probation,—and there are honored memories of these pioneers and leaders—has come to be less conspicuous as an exception. The effect is marked in increased reliance upon this instrumentality, both for information which is illuminating upon the court's final problem and for the supervision by competent officers in an increased and increasing proportion of cases. Discrimination, which is the soul of probation, has become possible through knowledge of each situation, and its exercise has gone far to save probation from reproach while it has been saving the taxpayer and saving the common security.

Variation in Use of Probation

Less can be claimed for uniform advance in the municipal and district courts. Indeed one of the items in the claim for uniformity in the use of probation, measured by years, is the constant differences of its employment in the primary courts. The showing of the table of relative dispositions of cases, court by court, would raise a question in the mind of the student of the situation as to the uniform acceptance of the idea and value of probation.

With the average for the lower courts of 27.9 per cent placed on probation out of the total convictions, municipal courts in Boston vary from as low as 12.7 per cent to as high as 41.1 per cent. District courts of 100,000 population range from 3.9 to 43.8; those having a population of between 50,000 and 100,000 vary from 4.1 to 50.3. In the next smaller group, the lowest is 5.9 and the highest 53.9; while in the courts serving less than 25,000 the lowest is 5.1 and the highest 78.2.

Courts in industrial cities of almost identical population present such contrast as 3.9 per cent and 33.3 per cent use of probation; in another instance 4.1 per cent as against 50.3. In small courts, neighbors in the population ranking, present such contrasts as 9.1 and 46.4 or 5.1 and 29.2.

Sentences to institutions match in their unequal distribution the differences shown above as to probation. One Boston municipal court sends but 2.5 per cent of its convicted offenders, while another commits 12.3. Large district courts vary from 3.4 to 26.6. In smaller courts there are percentages as low as 1.3 and as high as 18.4.

The Courts' Varying Estimate of Probation

Such wide differences in the use of probation and in institutional sentences are in a measure accounted for by local conditions, such, for example, as a large proportion of motor vehicle offenses, swelling the number of cases disposed of by fines, thus depressing the proportions both of probation and commitment totals. The main demonstration is that the judges have their individual estimates of the value of probation and the effect of jail terms. The exercise of their discretion by the courts is so far an essential of our court system that the differences in the use of probation offer no ground for criticism when they are due to the estimate by the courts of its value. Their

respective policies continue from year to year and, as has been noted above, the state average persists.

Another factor, however, is the relative interest and efficiency of the probation officers. Instances could be cited where a court has for years entrusted its probation officer with few cases and when a change to a new officer occurs immediately changes its policy and the proportion of probation cases doubles. Or a new judge comes to the bench and brings a new policy with corresponding effect.

Theoretically there may be set up a standard as to the proportion of offenders who should be given the benefit of probation. There have been public, sometimes official, statements to the effect that too few offenders are imprisoned. Practically and obviously there is no scientific value in either conclusion. The determination rests upon the individual case; that is the key to probation policy and it is as truly the key to every other disposition of a correctional problem. Comparison of results in subsequent behavior supply the answer as to relative merits of differing policies and it is to be assumed that the respective judges arrive at their own conclusions, which, however widely differing, are entitled to respect.

To the extent that the quality of the probation officer's diligence and other merits affect the court's resort to probation, the case becomes an urgent one for the employment of the best men and women available. The combination of other offices with that of the probation officer works to a disadvantage which is reflected in the statistical tables, but is more serious than these figures and percentages reveal. Quite too gradually the separation of the probation service from that of clerks of the courts and from that of deputy sheriffs is being brought about. Legislation to dissolve such combinations, repeatedly urged by the Commission, fails by reason of the active interest of the incumbents and the acquiescence of the courts directly concerned. The case for it is unmistakable.

Results in Probation Cases

Results of probation, as measured by the action of the courts in final disposition, are shown, year by year, to be more and more satisfactory. This year, the percentage of those who are discharged at the end of a probation term rises to 80.3. These are the successes. The failures are indicated by the surrenders. These show a somewhat surprising reduction this year. Out of 26,760 terminations of probation reported only 1,688 were due to surrenders, 6.3 per cent. This is nearly 50 per cent less than in 1926 and is the lowest in the history of probation. There has been no relaxation in the use of this power by the officers. The service does not tolerate the failure of the person to live up to the conditions imposed by the court and the small number of outright failures is the strongest testimony to the proper selection of probation cases and the success of the process.

Offences as to Which Probation is Used

In the report of last year analysis was made of the offences which had been committed by persons placed on probation. They represent a wide range and one that changes slightly. This year there have been increases of note in the number where the offence was assault and battery from 704 in 1926 to 1,149; in violation of the liquor law from 2,747 to 3,011; in violations of the traffic law from 241 to 537; in operating a motor vehicle under the influence of liquor from 319 to 408, these being first offenders.

In the list the other numerous offences, not showing marked change in number, are: breaking and entering, 1,129; drunkenness, 10,830; larceny, 2,998; motor vehicle violations, 2,763; non-support and neglect of family, 2,328; sex offences, 1,820. Only the offences which clearly fall outside the scope of probation, not by limitation of statute but by their determinedly criminal nature, are unrepresented. Only two burglars appear; there are but two cases of manslaughter; there are 30 of larceny from the person, but it is not likely they include a single professional pickpocket; of the more serious assaults, according to statutory name, there are 92; there are 6 cases

of resisting a police officer, 11 of attempt to rescue a prisoner, 35 of rape, 21 of robbery. The slightest familiarity with the operations of our courts makes certain that these offences, serious as they are in name, were not correspondingly so in fact and were not committed by determined criminals.

Collections and Cost

The familiar test, but by no means conclusive one, as to the value of probation, is in the amounts collected by probation officers from persons in their charge. These have mounted with every year and this year reached a total of \$1,904,158. The largest item is in non-support cases, the sum of which is \$1,403,308, about \$71,000 more than in 1926. For restitution, the collections were \$168,485. The suspended sentence returns, largely in fines which the probation officer collects only in connection with suspension of sentence, were \$327,259.

The cost of probation in all the courts of the state was \$463,079.

Bureau of Records

The achievement of Massachusetts in establishing a complete clearing-house of all criminal court records has received widespread attention outside the state. At home it has become so well-settled a system as not to have or to need extended comment. The regular and accurate reporting of all cases on the day they appear in court is being performed by the probation officers in a way to deserve the highest commendation. As much may be said for the departments and institutions in the reporting of individual paroles and revocations of parole. The reporting is so complete that it is doubtful if any cases fail to be recorded in the Commission's office.

The improvements recently secured are in the fullness of identification facts, although there are a few courts which fail to require in motor vehicle cases the statement by the offender of all that is necessary for establishing identity. The existence in the file of the bureau of individual cards with only the name of the offender and his street address has not full value because it does not sufficiently identify when information is wanted in a later offence, probably but not surely by the same person. Such partial records are, however, the exception. In the main, the bureau is able to meet requirements with an accuracy in identification that leaves small margin for doubt.

The demands upon the bureau grow and constitute an office-service problem which is the more serious because of lack of room. Utilization of floor space with the greatest economy and arrangement of files, desks, and telephone booths has become a science in the Commission's office. The clerical force of 27 girls has developed an expertness in the filing of records and swift search that is admirable; and the users of the records, court, police and public departments, express satisfaction in the service given.

The number of inquiries for records shows an increase each month over the corresponding one of the previous year. The daily intake of records is on an average of 610. The inquiries for the year were 112,421.

Half Century of Probation

The year just closed was the 49th in the history of probation in Massachusetts. During the coming year the half century will be reached. The act of the legislature of 1878, which established probation in Suffolk county with a single officer appointed by the mayor, has come to have historical interest because of its pioneer character. It has been followed by the act of 1891, providing a probation officer in every district court, that of 1898, extending the service to the Superior Court, and that of 1908, providing for state supervision by the Commission. The half-century's completion will doubtless call for some observance.

The main features of probation, its essential service as a measure of outdoor reformation, are seemingly beyond challenge. Its merit in operation has been attained through the devotion to their duty by a force of officers in whom the courts place great confidence and by whom an example of

faithful service has been supplied. The Commission, through its executive staff, has close and cordial relations with all the officers and there is cause for satisfaction in the progress of this adjunct to the courts of the entire state.

Qualifications for the Service

With the theory of probation established, with its application to given cases entirely within the discretion of the courts and with its methods fairly well settled through the experience of officers and the efforts of the Commission, the direction in which improvement and progress is to be sought is the qualification of probation officers for their work.

Our officers have been called from about every walk in life. In the early years there was hardly any field of experience which could supply a test of fitness and there was no special education which could be regarded as preparatory. The situation has changed. Social agencies have not only increased in number but have called into being a numerous class of specialized workers. Schools of social work and, more extensively, courses in social work have been developed. Thus special training has not only become available, but has come to be required for eligibility to employment in every kind of responsible humanitarian service at all resembling the probation officer's work.

Meanwhile, probation appointments have proceeded on the same basis as in the early days. Nothing like a standard of education and training has been set up. Good appointments have indeed been made; but so have indifferent and even unfit ones. There has been no advance from the level upon which the officers were selected who are now the seniors in the service to which they have brought distinction and success. The exactions of the service have become far more severe; the expectation on the part of the public is higher; the need of skill and efficiency in this work has become more definite and positive. The demands of such a developing situation have been met by the officers out of their ripening experience. It cannot be expected that they will be met by untrained and unprepared persons coming into the service. Certainly the probation service cannot be expected to keep pace with other activities of like accountability or to rise to its own possibilities on disregard for such standards of equipment as are elsewhere established. Nor can it hope to attract the specially educated and trained workers if such education and training are not given a value.

The unrestricted power of appointment of probation officers by the courts has not gone unchallenged. There have been proposals of change in the law to make appointments subject to approval. Although it was proposed at the time the Commission was created that it should have the power of review, the Commission has not only not asked such addition to its authority but has steadfastly opposed it. The repeated suggestion that the office be put under the civil service has never gained strong support. The confidential nature of the office in its relation to the court is regarded as ample reason for keeping appointments judicial and free from limitation. There is a growing disposition among the judges to avail themselves of consultation with the Commission, which is theoretically at least interested and informed as to the requirements of the service. But all this is informal and correspondingly uncertain of operation as to situations where it would seem to be most needed.

It is impossible to view the course of events with calm content. Only indifference to the importance of the service both to the courts and the Commonwealth would allow the need of its best development to go unheeded. There doubtless are steps that can be taken entirely consistently with the treasured rule of judicial appointments that would secure some advance. Not to limit the discussion to any definite project, this comment is offered for the Commission's consideration and possible special study.

Probation Conferences

Two general conferences of probation officers and several regional ones have been held during the year, including a four-day institute for the officers

of Suffolk county. They are but one feature of the effort in which the Commission, the probation officers and, above all, the courts have an interest and share to bring this service nearer to a fulfilment of its design.

New Members of the Commission

The Commission's membership has undergone an unprecedented change during the year. Charles M. Davenport, Esq., a member for twelve years and chairman during most of them, resigned because of the pressure of other service to the state. Allison G. Catheron, whose term expired, did not seek reappointment, because of the demands of his professional work. Hon. Thomas H. Dowd, justice of the Boston Municipal court, resigned. These three had been devoted through several years to the interests of the Commonwealth in this relation. In their places Chief Justice W. Perley Hall of the Superior Court, appointed Hon. Benjamin Loring Young, former speaker of the House of Representatives and a member of the law firm of Ropes, Gray, Boyden & Perkins, who was immediately made chairman; Col. Robert E. Goodwin, head of the firm of Goodwin, Procter, Field & Hoar; and Daniel J. Lyne, head of the firm of Lyne, Woodworth & Evarts. These prominent attorneys have brought continued strength to the Commission, in association with Hon. Arthur P. Stone, justice of the Third District Court of Eastern Middlesex, and Miss Mary E. Driscoll, member of the Boston Licensing Board.

The deputy commissioner begs leave to include in this report his acknowledgment of his personal regard towards, and admiration for, the public services of the retiring members and of his already formed appreciation of the interest of their successors as well as his obligations to the two members of longer acquaintance.

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT C. PARSONS,
Deputy Commissioner.

STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 1. — CASES PLACED ON PROBATION
Superior Courts

| Counties | Juveniles | | Adults | | Aggregate |
|---|-----------|---------|--------|---------|-----------|
| | Males | Females | Males | Females | |
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket | 1 | — | 157 | 16 | 174 |
| Berkshire | 1 | — | 17 | — | 18 |
| Essex | 6 | — | 82 | 14 | 102 |
| Franklin | 2 | — | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| Hampden | 8 | — | 101 | 13 | 122 |
| Hampshire | — | — | 7 | — | 7 |
| Middlesex | 44 | 3 | 360 | 20 | 427 |
| Norfolk | 4 | — | 67 | 1 | 72 |
| Plymouth | 1 | — | 58 | 6 | 65 |
| Suffolk | 39 | 4 | 987 | 174 | 1,204 |
| Worcester | 34 | 4 | 161 | 8 | 207 |
| Total | 140 | 11 | 2,003 | 253 | 2,407 |

Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|--------|
| <i>Boston</i> | | | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | — | — | 3,029 | 962 | 3,991 |
| Boston, Juvenile | 317 | 96 | — | — | 413 |
| Brighton, Municipal | 63 | 5 | 311 | 28 | 407 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 50 | 6 | 1,053 | 34 | 1,143 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 97 | 3 | 304 | 15 | 419 |
| East Boston, District | 242 | — | 1,021 | 73 | 1,336 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 145 | 10 | 2,535 | 313 | 3,003 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 71 | — | 316 | 37 | 424 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 103 | 2 | 380 | 2 | 487 |
| Chelsea, District | 108 | 12 | 667 | 35 | 822 |
| Total | 1,196 | 134 | 9,616 | 1,499 | 12,445 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | 106 | 13 | 381 | 20 | 520 |
| Springfield, District | 138 | 16 | 429 | 127 | 710 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 174 | 4 | 1,242 | 40 | 1,460 |
| Bristol, Third District | 109 | 10 | 294 | 52 | 465 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 96 | 9 | 592 | 36 | 733 |
| Lowell, District | — | 9 | 549 | 274 | 832 |
| Bristol, Second District | 121 | 12 | 560 | 62 | 755 |
| Essex, Southern District | 144 | 4 | 615 | 63 | 826 |
| Lawrence, District | 141 | 6 | 154 | 43 | 344 |
| Total | 1,029 | 83 | 4,816 | 717 | 6,645 |
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Norfolk, East District | 87 | — | 763 | 36 | 886 |
| Somerville, District | 151 | 6 | 138 | 13 | 308 |
| Essex, First District | 66 | 5 | 318 | 19 | 408 |
| Brockton, District | 78 | 8 | 557 | 46 | 689 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 21 | — | 8 | 1 | 30 |
| Holyoke, District | 65 | 3 | 350 | 20 | 438 |
| Hampshire, District | 25 | 1 | 387 | 9 | 422 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 20 | 3 | 445 | 17 | 485 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 15 | — | 140 | 13 | 168 |
| Bristol, First District | 30 | 5 | 204 | 9 | 248 |
| Total | 558 | 31 | 3,310 | 183 | 4,082 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | 41 | 1 | 179 | 10 | 231 |
| Newton, District | 74 | 2 | 435 | 16 | 527 |
| Fitchburg, District | 44 | — | 260 | 11 | 315 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 19 | 1 | 93 | 4 | 117 |
| Franklin, District | 11 | 4 | 55 | 10 | 80 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 8 | 2 | 95 | 8 | 113 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 43 | 3 | 98 | 5 | 149 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | 6 | — | 59 | 2 | 67 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 8 | — | 209 | 9 | 226 |
| Chicopee, District | 33 | 3 | 110 | 18 | 164 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 20 | 1 | 276 | 6 | 303 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 22 | 3 | 185 | 5 | 215 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 1 | — | 53 | 2 | 56 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 25 | — | 39 | 3 | 67 |
| Middlesex, Central District | 23 | — | 260 | 1 | 284 |
| Total | 378 | 20 | 2,406 | 110 | 2,914 |

TABLE 1. — CASES PLACED ON PROBATION—Continued
Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts—Concluded

| Courts | Juveniles | | Adults | | Aggregate |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|-----------|
| | Males | Females | Males | Females | |
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | — | — | 46 | — | 46 |
| Hampden, Western District | 45 | — | 134 | 16 | 195 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | 7 | — | 50 | 3 | 60 |
| Marlborough, District | 1 | — | 134 | 13 | 148 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 14 | — | 49 | 1 | 64 |
| Newburyport, District | 32 | 1 | 479 | 22 | 534 |
| Plymouth, Third District | — | — | 67 | 2 | 69 |
| Peabody, District | 59 | — | 321 | 10 | 390 |
| Leominster, District | 18 | — | 181 | 17 | 216 |
| Worcester, Western District | 3 | 1 | 64 | 3 | 71 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 8 | — | 19 | 1 | 28 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | 3 | — | 49 | 6 | 58 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | 8 | — | 74 | 1 | 83 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 18 | — | 149 | 6 | 173 |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | 1 | — | 53 | 1 | 55 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | — | — | 26 | — | 26 |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | 13 | — | 155 | 6 | 174 |
| Essex, Second District | 6 | 1 | 66 | 6 | 79 |
| Barnstable, First District | 28 | 2 | 83 | 16 | 129 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 8 | 2 | 40 | 3 | 53 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 2 | — | 18 | 1 | 21 |
| Natick, District | 8 | — | 74 | — | 82 |
| Lee, District | — | — | 11 | — | 11 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | — | — | 8 | — | 8 |
| Franklin, Eastern District | 2 | — | 1 | — | 3 |
| Essex, Third District | — | — | 38 | — | 38 |
| Winchendon, District | — | — | 32 | — | 32 |
| Dukes County, District | 6 | — | 4 | — | 10 |
| Williamstown, District | — | — | 10 | — | 10 |
| Nantucket, District | 4 | — | 5 | — | 9 |
| Total | 294 | 7 | 2,440 | 134 | 2,875 |

SUMMARY

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------|-----|--------|-------|--------|
| Total, District Courts | 3,455 | 275 | 22,588 | 2,643 | 28,961 |
| Total, Superior Courts | 140 | 11 | 2,003 | 253 | 2,407 |
| Aggregate | 3,595 | 286 | 24,591 | 2,896 | 31,368 |

TABLE 2. — CASES PLACED ON PROBATION
Age Distribution

| Years of Age | Male | Female | Total |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Under 10 | 262 | 4 | 266 |
| 10-12 | 852 | 32 | 884 |
| 13-14 | 1,133 | 99 | 1,232 |
| 15-16 | 1,348 | 151 | 1,499 |
| 17-20 | 2,767 | 411 | 3,178 |
| 21-30 | 7,571 | 820 | 8,391 |
| 31-40 | 6,844 | 931 | 7,775 |
| 41-50 | 4,468 | 517 | 4,985 |
| Over 50 | 2,941 | 217 | 3,158 |
| Total | 28,186 | 3,182 | 31,368 |

TABLE 3. — RESULTS OF PROBATION
Superior Courts

| Counties | Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation | Disappeared and Defaulted | Case Filed or Probationer Discharged |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County, Nantucket | 7 | 2 | 61 |
| Berkshire | 1 | — | 12 |
| Essex | 13 | 2 | 57 |
| Franklin | 1 | — | 12 |
| Hampden | 6 | 3 | 44 |
| Hampshire | 1 | — | 27 |
| Middlesex | 78 | 47 | 391 |
| Norfolk | 2 | 8 | 57 |
| Plymouth | 2 | 5 | 60 |
| Suffolk | 140 | 55 | 456 |
| Worcester | 39 | 25 | 157 |
| Total | 290 | 147 | 1,334 |

Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| <i>Boston</i> | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | 219 | 1,311 | 2,852 |
| Boston, Juvenile | 27 | 23 | 408 |
| Brighton, Municipal | 2 | 40 | 95 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 68 | 65 | 1,051 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 3 | 26 | 525 |
| East Boston, District | 15 | 5 | 314 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 39 | 248 | 1,930 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 10 | 2 | 278 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 34 | 11 | 215 |
| Chelsea, District | 10 | — | 8 |
| Total | 427 | 1,731 | 7,676 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | 49 | 68 | 404 |
| Springfield, District | 89 | 83 | 726 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 20 | 230 | 1,125 |
| Bristol, Third District | 50 | 48 | 494 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 63 | 295 | 969 |
| Lowell, District | 60 | — | 519 |
| Bristol, Second District | 7 | 67 | 770 |
| Essex, Southern District | 117 | 61 | 609 |
| Lawrence, District | 3 | 33 | 157 |
| Total | 458 | 885 | 5,773 |
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Norfolk, East District | 11 | 310 | 458 |
| Somerville, District | 10 | 86 | 198 |
| Essex, First District | 42 | 26 | 320 |
| Brockton, District | 71 | 27 | 488 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 1 | — | 23 |
| Holyoke, District | 3 | — | 262 |
| Hampshire, District | 12 | 3 | 502 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 79 | 82 | 523 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 21 | — | 106 |
| Bristol, First District | 1 | — | 103 |
| Total | 251 | 534 | 2,983 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | 6 | 5 | 222 |
| Newton, District | 41 | 64 | 498 |
| Fitchburg, District | 13 | 33 | 276 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 3 | 8 | 167 |
| Franklin, District | 8 | — | 63 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 1 | — | 40 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 12 | 7 | 125 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | — | — | 17 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 2 | 2 | 129 |
| Chicopee, District | 2 | 1 | 101 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 10 | 1 | 87 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 7 | 9 | 102 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 20 | 3 | 51 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 5 | — | 10 |
| Middlesex, Central District | 1 | 39 | 286 |
| Total | 131 | 172 | 2,174 |

TABLE 3.-- RESULTS OF PROBATION--Concluded
Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts--Concluded

| Counties | Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation | Disappeared and Defaulted | Case Filed or Probationer Discharged |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | — | 1 | 25 |
| Hampden, Western District | 33 | 6 | 151 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | — | — | 20 |
| Marlborough, District | 14 | 3 | 99 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 6 | — | 34 |
| Newburyport, District | 28 | — | 12 |
| Plymouth, Third District | — | 7 | 44 |
| Peabody, District | 11 | 37 | 370 |
| Leominster, District | 4 | 10 | 183 |
| Worcester, Western District | 2 | 4 | 85 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 2 | 1 | 61 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | — | 1 | 53 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | 1 | 24 | 73 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 5 | 1 | 20 |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | — | 1 | 42 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | 1 | 1 | 19 |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | — | — | 3 |
| Essex, Second District | 7 | 8 | 67 |
| Barnstable, First District | — | — | 42 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 7 | — | 38 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 3 | — | 19 |
| Natick, District | 4 | 1 | 57 |
| Lee, District | — | — | 10 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Franklin, Eastern District | — | — | 2 |
| Essex, Third District | — | — | 6 |
| Winchendon, District | — | — | 5 |
| Dukes County, District | — | — | 1 |
| Williamstown, District | — | — | 5 |
| Nantucket, District | — | — | — |
| Total | 131 | 107 | 1,556 |
| Aggregate | 1,688 | 3,576 | 21,496 |

TABLE 4.— SUMMARY OF PROBATION RESULTS IN ALL COURTS

| | Superior Courts | District Courts | Total | Per Cent |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|
| Surrendered to the Courts for Violation of the terms of Probation | 290 | 1,398 | 1,688 | 6.3 |
| Disappeared and Defaulted | 147 | 3,429 | 3,576 | 13.4 |
| Case Filed or Probationer Discharged | 1,334 | 20,162 | 21,496 | 80.3 |

TABLE 5.— PROBATION BY OFFENCES
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted

| OFFENCES | Juveniles | | Adults | | Aggre- gate |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| Abandonment | — | — | 8 | 4 | 12 |
| Abduction | — | — | — | — | — |
| Abortion | — | — | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Abuse of Female Child | 3 | — | 9 | — | 12 |
| Accessory | 2 | — | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Accosting Person of Opposite Sex | 2 | — | 28 | 2 | 32 |
| Act, Unnatural | 3 | — | 10 | — | 15 |
| Adultery | — | 1 | 100 | 104 | 205 |
| Affray | 1 | — | 14 | — | 15 |
| Appropriation, Unlawful | 169 | — | 150 | — | 319 |

TABLE 5. — PROBATION BY OFFENCES—Continued
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted—
 Continued

| OFFENCE | Juveniles | | Adults | | Aggregate |
|--|-----------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| Arson | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| Assault | 15 | — | 64 | 5 | 84 |
| Assault, Indecent | 2 | — | 11 | — | 13 |
| Assault on Officer | — | — | 28 | 1 | 29 |
| Assault with Dangerous Weapon | 1 | — | 33 | 7 | 41 |
| Assault with Intent to Kill | 1 | — | 3 | — | 4 |
| Assault with Intent to Rob | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Assault and Battery | 74 | 15 | 941 | 119 | 1,149 |
| Assault to Rape | 2 | — | 2 | — | 4 |
| Attempt to Commit Crime | 2 | — | 1 | — | 3 |
| Blackmail | — | — | — | — | — |
| Bigamy | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Breaking and Entering | 796 | 4 | 327 | 2 | 1,129 |
| Breaking Glass | 108 | — | 39 | 6 | 153 |
| Bribery | — | — | 6 | — | 6 |
| Building, Burning | 1 | — | — | — | 1 |
| Burglar Tools, Possessing | 1 | — | 5 | — | 6 |
| Burglary | — | — | 2 | — | 2 |
| Chastity, Crime against | — | — | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Cigarettes, Selling to Minor | — | — | — | — | — |
| City Ordinance and Town By-Law, Violation of | 77 | — | 149 | 6 | 232 |
| Conspiracy | — | — | 14 | 2 | 16 |
| Contempt of Court | — | — | 4 | — | 4 |
| Cruelty to Animals | 5 | — | 38 | 1 | 44 |
| Dangerous Weapon, Carrying | 19 | — | 122 | 5 | 146 |
| Delinquency | 168 | 9 | 10 | — | 187 |
| Delinquency, Contributing to | — | — | — | — | — |
| Desertion | — | — | 31 | 4 | 35 |
| Destitute Parents, Non-support of | — | — | 43 | 11 | 54 |
| Disorderly Conduct | 2 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 29 |
| Disorderly House, Keeping | — | — | 12 | 17 | 29 |
| Disturbing Public Assembly | 13 | 1 | 18 | 4 | 36 |
| Disturbing Peace | 18 | 1 | 239 | 38 | 296 |
| Dog, Keeping Dangerous | — | — | 4 | — | 4 |
| Dog, Keeping Unlicensed | — | — | 40 | 2 | 42 |
| Drug Law, Violation of | — | — | 26 | 10 | 36 |
| Drunkenness | 16 | — | 10,244 | 570 | 10,830 |
| Eavesdropping | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Enticing | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Exposure, Indecent | 5 | — | 66 | 4 | 75 |
| False Pretences | 2 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 25 |
| Fare, Evading | 12 | — | 28 | — | 40 |
| Fire Alarm, Giving False | 29 | — | 17 | — | 46 |
| Firearm, Discharging | 4 | — | — | — | 4 |
| Firearm, Alien having | 1 | — | 34 | — | 35 |
| Fire, Setting | 6 | — | 13 | 3 | 22 |
| Fish and Game Law, Violation of | 5 | — | 122 | — | 127 |
| Food Law, Violation of | — | — | 14 | 2 | 16 |
| Forgery | 4 | 3 | 33 | 7 | 47 |
| Fornication | 2 | 11 | 73 | 131 | 217 |
| Gaming | 41 | — | 265 | 19 | 325 |
| Gaming on Lord's Day | 1 | — | — | — | 1 |
| Health Regulations, Violation of | — | — | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| House of Ill Fame | — | — | 1 | 25 | 26 |
| Idle and Disorderly | 6 | 5 | 54 | 86 | 151 |
| Illegitimate Child Act, Violation of | 4 | — | 317 | 1 | 322 |
| Incest | — | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Kidnapping | — | — | 2 | — | 2 |
| Labor Law, Violation of | — | — | 41 | — | 41 |
| Language, Indecent | — | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Larceny | 1,130 | 112 | 1,242 | 514 | 2,998 |
| Larceny from Person | 6 | — | 22 | 2 | 30 |
| Lewd and Lascivious Co-habitation | 5 | 2 | 150 | 144 | 301 |
| Lewdness | 7 | 18 | 39 | 57 | 121 |
| Liquor Law, Violation of | 7 | 3 | 2,314 | 687 | 3,011 |
| Lodging House Law, Violation of | — | — | 57 | 16 | 73 |
| Loitering | 2 | — | 15 | — | 17 |
| Manslaughter | — | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Mayhem | — | — | 2 | — | 2 |
| Medical Law, Violation of | — | — | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Milk Law, Violation of | — | — | 12 | — | 12 |
| Mischief, Malicious | 53 | — | 26 | — | 79 |
| Missiles, Throwing | 12 | — | 5 | — | 17 |
| Misuse of Transfer | — | — | 34 | 2 | 36 |
| Motor Vehicles Law, Violation of | 152 | 1 | 2,576 | 34 | 2,763 |
| Motor Vehicle Law, Operating without Insurance | 1 | — | 39 | — | 40 |

TABLE 5. — PROBATION BY OFFENCES — Concluded
Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted—
 Concluded

| OFFENCE | Juveniles | | Adults | | Aggregate |
|--|-----------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| Motor Vehicle, Operating under Influence of Liquor | — | — | 402 | 6 | 408 |
| Motor Vehicle, Operating to Endanger Lives | 1 | — | 68 | — | 69 |
| Neglect of Children | 2 | 1 | 115 | 33 | 151 |
| Neglect of Family | — | — | 406 | 2 | 408 |
| Nightwalking | — | 1 | — | 43 | 44 |
| Nonsupport | 2 | — | 1,754 | 13 | 1,769 |
| Nuisance | — | — | 6 | — | 6 |
| Obscene Language | — | — | — | — | — |
| Obscene Literature | — | — | 4 | — | 4 |
| Park Rule, Violation of | 2 | — | 31 | 3 | 36 |
| Perjury | — | — | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Police Officer, Assuming to be | — | — | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Polygamy | — | — | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Police Officer, Refusing to Aid | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Police Officer, Resisting | — | — | 6 | — | 6 |
| Prisoner, Rescuing and Attempting | 1 | — | 9 | 1 | 11 |
| Profanity | 2 | — | 15 | 1 | 18 |
| Property, Concealing Leased | — | — | 29 | 5 | 34 |
| Property, Conveying Fraudulently | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Property, Injury to | 145 | — | 81 | 8 | 234 |
| Property, Receiving Stolen | 7 | — | 73 | 12 | 92 |
| Property, Selling Mortgaged | — | — | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| Prostitution | — | — | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Railer and Brawler | — | — | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Railroad Law, Violation of | 1 | — | 6 | — | 7 |
| Rape | 1 | — | 33 | 1 | 35 |
| Ride, Stealing | 42 | — | 1 | — | 43 |
| Road Law, Violation of | — | — | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| Robbery | 1 | — | 20 | — | 21 |
| Runaway | 17 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 41 |
| School Law, Violation of | 22 | — | 52 | 17 | 91 |
| School Offender | 27 | — | 9 | 2 | 38 |
| Soliciting, Immoral | — | — | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Stubbornness | 81 | 55 | 48 | 35 | 219 |
| Suspicious Person | — | — | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| Sunday Law, Violation of | 10 | — | 65 | 6 | 81 |
| Threatening | — | — | 33 | 7 | 40 |
| Track Walking | 16 | — | 32 | — | 48 |
| Traffic Law, Violation of | 2 | — | 533 | 2 | 537 |
| Trespassing | 138 | — | 98 | 4 | 240 |
| Truancy | 74 | 6 | — | — | 80 |
| True Name Law, Violation of | — | — | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Uttering | — | — | 2 | — | 2 |
| Vagabond | — | — | 5 | — | 5 |
| Vagrancy | 1 | 2 | 82 | 34 | 119 |
| Waywardness | — | 13 | — | — | 13 |
| Weights and Measures Law, Violation of | — | — | 11 | — | 11 |
| Total | 3,595 | 286 | 24,548 | 2,939 | 31,368 |

TABLE 6. — PROBATION POPULATION
Persons Remaining on Probation September 30, 1927

| Courts | Boys | Girls | Total Juveniles | Men | Women | Total Adults | Aggregate |
|---|------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|--------------|-----------|
| <i>Superior</i> | | | | | | | |
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket | 1 | — | 1 | 145 | 15 | 160 | 161 |
| Berkshire | 1 | — | 1 | 6 | — | 6 | 7 |
| Essex | 5 | — | 5 | 258 | 20 | 278 | 283 |
| Franklin | 1 | — | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Hampden | 2 | — | 2 | 21 | 2 | 23 | 25 |
| Hampshire | — | — | — | 14 | 2 | 16 | 16 |
| Middlesex | 52 | 3 | 55 | 600 | 24 | 624 | 679 |
| Norfolk | 3 | — | 3 | 99 | 4 | 103 | 106 |
| Plymouth | 2 | — | 2 | 81 | 7 | 88 | 90 |
| Suffolk | 46 | 11 | 57 | 1,284 | 179 | 1,463 | 1,520 |
| Worcester | 35 | 3 | 38 | 161 | 8 | 169 | 207 |
| Total | 148 | 17 | 165 | 2,672 | 262 | 2,934 | 3,099 |
| <i>Boston</i> | | | | | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | — | — | — | 1,329 | 600 | 1,929 | 1,929 |
| Boston, Juvenile | 216 | 93 | 309 | — | — | — | 309 |
| Brighton, Municipal | 17 | 4 | 21 | 106 | 9 | 115 | 136 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 30 | 6 | 36 | 290 | 16 | 306 | 342 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 40 | 3 | 43 | 215 | 9 | 224 | 267 |
| East Boston, District | 116 | 1 | 117 | 317 | 31 | 348 | 465 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 133 | 11 | 144 | 1,291 | 303 | 1,594 | 1,738 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 21 | 1 | 22 | 75 | 8 | 83 | 105 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 40 | 1 | 41 | 48 | 6 | 54 | 95 |
| Chelsea, District | 91 | 11 | 102 | 588 | 50 | 638 | 740 |
| Total | 704 | 131 | 835 | 4,259 | 1,032 | 5,291 | 6,126 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | 104 | 16 | 120 | 168 | 18 | 186 | 306 |
| Springfield, District | 217 | 28 | 245 | 549 | 187 | 736 | 981 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 136 | 3 | 139 | 310 | 7 | 317 | 456 |
| Bristol, Third District | 84 | 13 | 97 | 224 | 38 | 262 | 359 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 92 | 21 | 113 | 566 | 47 | 613 | 726 |
| Lowell, District | 96 | 7 | 103 | 413 | 17 | 430 | 533 |
| Bristol, Second District | 54 | 28 | 82 | 293 | 43 | 336 | 418 |
| Essex, Southern District | 87 | 3 | 90 | 229 | 35 | 264 | 354 |
| Lawrence, District | 108 | 8 | 116 | 120 | 22 | 142 | 258 |
| Total | 978 | 127 | 1,105 | 2,872 | 414 | 3,286 | 4,391 |
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | |
| Norfolk, Eastern District | 79 | — | 79 | 234 | 22 | 256 | 335 |
| Somerville, District | 66 | 3 | 69 | 132 | 9 | 141 | 210 |
| Essex, First District | 60 | 6 | 66 | 197 | 22 | 219 | 285 |
| Brockton, District | 51 | 2 | 53 | 194 | 21 | 215 | 268 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 1 | — | 1 | 1 | — | 1 | 2 |
| Holyoke, District | 69 | 6 | 75 | 666 | 52 | 718 | 793 |
| Hampshire, District | 46 | 4 | 50 | 368 | 21 | 389 | 439 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 18 | 1 | 19 | 201 | 18 | 219 | 238 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 25 | 1 | 26 | 195 | 14 | 209 | 235 |
| Bristol, First District | 20 | 2 | 22 | 112 | 7 | 119 | 141 |
| Total | 435 | 25 | 460 | 2,300 | 186 | 2,486 | 2,946 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | 18 | 2 | 20 | 119 | 11 | 130 | 150 |
| Newton, District | 85 | 12 | 97 | 312 | 37 | 349 | 446 |
| Fitchburg, District | 18 | — | 18 | 53 | 11 | 64 | 82 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 13 | — | 13 | 65 | 4 | 69 | 82 |
| Franklin, District | 11 | 1 | 12 | 53 | 12 | 65 | 77 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 17 | — | 17 | 71 | 4 | 75 | 92 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 15 | 1 | 16 | 60 | 4 | 64 | 80 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | 17 | — | 17 | 30 | 2 | 32 | 49 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 7 | — | 7 | 112 | 4 | 116 | 123 |
| Chicopee, District | 42 | 3 | 45 | 125 | 28 | 153 | 198 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 15 | 1 | 16 | 65 | 2 | 67 | 83 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 4 | — | 4 | 119 | 1 | 120 | 124 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 1 | — | 1 | 46 | 1 | 47 | 48 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 12 | 2 | 14 | 40 | 1 | 41 | 55 |
| Middlesex, Central District | 2 | — | 2 | 81 | — | 81 | 83 |
| Total | 277 | 22 | 299 | 1,351 | 122 | 1,473 | 1,772 |

TABLE 6. — PROBATION POPULATION — Concluded
Persons Remaining on Probation September 30, 1927 — Concluded

| <i>Courts</i> | Boys | Girls | Total Juve- niles | Men | Women | Total Adults | Aggre- gate |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | 2 | — | 2 | 12 | — | 12 | 14 |
| Hampden, Western District | 40 | 2 | 42 | 99 | 9 | 108 | 150 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | 3 | — | 3 | 32 | 2 | 34 | 37 |
| Marlborough, District | 7 | — | 7 | 85 | 6 | 91 | 98 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 11 | — | 11 | 26 | 1 | 27 | 38 |
| Newburyport, District | 14 | 2 | 16 | 52 | 5 | 57 | 73 |
| Plymouth, Third District | 2 | 1 | 3 | 25 | 2 | 27 | 30 |
| Peabody, District | 51 | — | 51 | 83 | 8 | 91 | 142 |
| Leominster, District | 18 | 1 | 19 | 53 | 8 | 61 | 80 |
| Worcester, Western District | 1 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 1 | 27 | 29 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 5 | 1 | 6 | 11 | — | 11 | 17 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | 18 | 3 | 21 | 81 | 12 | 93 | 114 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | 7 | — | 7 | 14 | — | 14 | 21 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 14 | — | 14 | 19 | 3 | 22 | 36 |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | — | — | — | 20 | 1 | 21 | 21 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | — | — | — | 9 | — | 9 | 9 |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | 8 | — | 8 | 26 | 2 | 28 | 36 |
| Essex, Second District | 14 | 1 | 15 | 158 | 14 | 172 | 187 |
| Barnstable, First District | 30 | 8 | 38 | 52 | 5 | 57 | 95 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 16 | 2 | 18 | 19 | 1 | 20 | 38 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 1 | — | 1 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 14 |
| Natick, District | 8 | — | 8 | 36 | — | 36 | 44 |
| Lee, District | 1 | — | 1 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 15 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | 2 | — | 2 | 8 | — | 8 | 10 |
| Franklin, Eastern District | 2 | — | 2 | 2 | — | 2 | 4 |
| Essex, Third District | — | — | — | 16 | — | 16 | 16 |
| Winchendon, District | — | — | — | 2 | — | 2 | 2 |
| Dukes County, District | — | — | — | 10 | — | 10 | 10 |
| Williamstown, District | 2 | — | 2 | 12 | — | 12 | 14 |
| Nantucket, District | 3 | — | 3 | 4 | — | 4 | 7 |
| Total | 280 | 22 | 302 | 1,015 | 84 | 1,099 | 1,401 |
| Aggregate | 2,822 | 344 | 3,166 | 14,469 | 2,100 | 16,569 | 19,735 |

TABLE 7. — COMPARATIVE DISPOSITIONS
Disposition of Cases after Conviction

| Courts | Total Dispositions | Probation | Per Cent | Sentenced to Institutions | Per Cent | Fined and Fine Paid | Per Cent | Filed | Per Cent |
|---|--------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|--------|----------|
| <i>Superior</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket | 909 | 174 | 19.1 | 210 | 23.1 | 315 | 34.7 | 210 | 23.1 |
| Berkshire | 125 | 18 | 14.4 | 27 | 21.6 | 16 | 12.8 | 64 | 51.2 |
| Essex | 894 | 95 | 10.6 | 253 | 28.3 | 335 | 37.5 | 211 | 23.6 |
| Franklin | 50 | 9 | 18.0 | 19 | 38.0 | 13 | 26.0 | 9 | 18.0 |
| Hampden | 419 | 122 | 29.1 | 94 | 22.5 | 64 | 15.3 | 139 | 33.1 |
| Hampshire | 99 | 7 | 7.1 | 29 | 29.3 | 34 | 34.3 | 29 | 29.3 |
| Middlesex | 2,105 | 427 | 20.3 | 507 | 24.1 | 579 | 27.5 | 592 | 28.1 |
| Norfolk | 456 | 72 | 15.8 | 75 | 16.5 | 133 | 29.1 | 176 | 38.6 |
| Plymouth | 448 | 65 | 14.5 | 96 | 21.4 | 160 | 35.8 | 127 | 28.3 |
| Suffolk | 4,244 | 1,201 | 28.3 | 839 | 19.8 | 823 | 19.4 | 1,381 | 32.5 |
| Worcester | 1,247 | 207 | 16.6 | 282 | 22.6 | 358 | 28.7 | 400 | 32.1 |
| Total | 10,996 | 2,397 | 21.8 | 2,431 | 22.1 | 2,830 | 25.8 | 3,338 | 30.3 |
| <i>Boston</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | 20,017 | 3,991 | 19.9 | 2,462 | 12.3 | 9,159 | 45.8 | 4,405 | 22.0 |
| Boston, Juvenile | 643 | 413 | 64.2 | 58 | 9.0 | — | — | 172 | 26.8 |
| Brighton, Municipal | 1,810 | 407 | 22.5 | 46 | 2.5 | 664 | 36.7 | 693 | 38.3 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 3,790 | 1,143 | 30.2 | 173 | 4.5 | 1,292 | 34.1 | 1,182 | 31.2 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 3,300 | 419 | 12.7 | 138 | 4.2 | 2,550 | 77.3 | 193 | 5.8 |
| East Boston, District | 3,252 | 1,336 | 41.1 | 134 | 4.2 | 399 | 12.2 | 1,383 | 42.5 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 10,238 | 3,003 | 29.4 | 265 | 2.5 | 3,418 | 33.4 | 3,552 | 34.7 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 3,520 | 424 | 12.1 | 262 | 7.4 | 1,300 | 36.9 | 1,534 | 43.6 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 3,469 | 487 | 14.1 | 178 | 5.2 | 1,687 | 48.6 | 1,117 | 32.1 |
| Chelsea, District | 4,331 | 822 | 18.9 | 218 | 5.1 | 3,031 | 69.9 | 260 | 6.1 |
| Total | 54,370 | 12,445 | 22.9 | 3,934 | 7.2 | 23,500 | 43.2 | 14,491 | 26.7 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | 3,667 | 520 | 14.2 | 184 | 5.0 | 2,314 | 63.1 | 649 | 17.7 |
| Springfield, District | 10,175 | 710 | 7.0 | 345 | 3.4 | 8,046 | 79.1 | 1,074 | 10.5 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 3,327 | 1,457 | 43.8 | 168 | 5.1 | 1,213 | 36.4 | 489 | 14.7 |
| Bristol, Third District | 1,933 | 465 | 24.1 | 228 | 11.8 | 685 | 35.4 | 555 | 28.7 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 6,328 | 733 | 11.5 | 562 | 8.9 | 2,029 | 32.1 | 3,004 | 47.5 |
| Lowell, District | 2,882 | 832 | 28.8 | 181 | 6.3 | 1,357 | 47.1 | 512 | 17.8 |
| Bristol, Second District | 2,264 | 755 | 33.3 | 512 | 26.6 | 654 | 28.9 | 343 | 15.2 |
| Essex, Southern District | 3,732 | 826 | 3.9 | 146 | 22.2 | 1,080 | 28.9 | 1,680 | 45.0 |
| Lawrence, District | 1,011 | 344 | 21.4 | 292 | 18.1 | 656 | 40.7 | 319 | 19.8 |
| Total | 35,919 | 6,642 | 18.5 | 2,618 | 7.3 | 18,034 | 50.2 | 8,625 | 24.0 |

TABLE 7. — COMPARATIVE DISPOSITIONS — Concluded
Disposition of Cases after Conviction — Concluded

| Courts | Total Dispositions | Probation | Per Cent | Sentenced to Institutions | Per Cent | Fined and Fine Paid | Per Cent | Filed | Per Cent |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|---------------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-------|----------|
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Norfolk, East District | 3,871 | 886 | 22.9 | 50 | 1.3 | 1,640 | 42.4 | 1,295 | 33.4 |
| Somerville, District | 1,743 | 308 | 17.7 | 101 | 5.8 | 1,189 | 68.2 | 145 | 8.3 |
| Essex, First District | 1,353 | 408 | 30.2 | 142 | 10.5 | 540 | 39.9 | 263 | 19.4 |
| Brockton, District | 1,392 | 699 | 50.3 | 155 | 11.1 | 444 | 31.8 | 94 | 6.8 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 739 | 30 | 4.1 | 79 | 10.7 | 399 | 53.9 | 231 | 31.3 |
| Holyoke, District | 1,390 | 438 | 31.6 | 150 | 10.8 | 728 | 52.3 | 74 | 5.3 |
| Hampshire, District | 1,038 | 422 | 40.7 | 63 | 6.0 | 499 | 48.1 | 54 | 5.2 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 1,559 | 485 | 31.1 | 59 | 3.8 | 585 | 37.5 | 430 | 27.6 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 1,023 | 168 | 16.4 | 64 | 6.3 | 547 | 53.5 | 244 | 23.8 |
| Bristol, First District | 791 | 248 | 31.4 | 76 | 9.6 | 284 | 35.9 | 183 | 23.1 |
| Total | 14,899 | 4,092 | 27.5 | 939 | 6.3 | 6,855 | 46.0 | 3,013 | 20.2 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | 1,816 | 231 | 12.7 | 93 | 5.1 | 952 | 52.4 | 540 | 29.8 |
| Newton, District | 1,176 | 527 | 44.8 | 36 | 3.1 | 380 | 32.3 | 233 | 19.8 |
| Fitchburg, District | 1,147 | 315 | 27.5 | 66 | 5.7 | 307 | 26.8 | 459 | 40.0 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 869 | 117 | 13.4 | 44 | 5.1 | 507 | 58.4 | 201 | 23.1 |
| Franklin, District | 436 | 80 | 12.2 | 53 | 18.4 | 216 | 49.5 | 87 | 19.9 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 588 | 113 | 19.2 | 46 | 7.8 | 225 | 38.4 | 204 | 34.6 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 963 | 149 | 15.5 | 26 | 2.7 | 502 | 52.2 | 286 | 29.6 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | 648 | 67 | 10.3 | 43 | 6.6 | 408 | 63.0 | 130 | 20.1 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 1,291 | 226 | 17.5 | 39 | 3.0 | 944 | 73.1 | 82 | 6.4 |
| Chicopee, District | 767 | 164 | 21.4 | 30 | 3.9 | 499 | 65.1 | 74 | 9.6 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 825 | 303 | 36.7 | 32 | 3.9 | 458 | 55.5 | 32 | 3.9 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 833 | 215 | 25.9 | 22 | 2.7 | 298 | 35.7 | 298 | 35.7 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 608 | 56 | 9.3 | 60 | 9.9 | 331 | 54.3 | 161 | 26.5 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 1,142 | 67 | 5.9 | 25 | 2.2 | 771 | 67.5 | 279 | 24.4 |
| Middlesex, Central District | 527 | 284 | 53.9 | 21 | 4.0 | 143 | 27.2 | 79 | 14.9 |
| Total | 13,636 | 2,914 | 21.4 | 636 | 4.6 | 6,941 | 50.9 | 3,145 | 23.1 |
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | 279 | 46 | 16.5 | 2 | .7 | 207 | 74.2 | 24 | 8.6 |
| Hampden, Western District | 813 | 195 | 24.1 | 51 | 6.3 | 439 | 53.9 | 128 | 15.7 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | 279 | 60 | 21.5 | 26 | 9.3 | 143 | 51.2 | 50 | 18.0 |
| Marlborough, District | 297 | 148 | 49.8 | 6 | 2.0 | 91 | 30.7 | 52 | 17.5 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 380 | 64 | 16.9 | 29 | 7.6 | 244 | 64.2 | 43 | 11.3 |
| Newburyport, District | 683 | 534 | 78.2 | 29 | 4.2 | 67 | 9.8 | 53 | 7.8 |
| Plymouth, Third District | 313 | 69 | 22.1 | 18 | 5.7 | 150 | 47.9 | 76 | 24.3 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Peabody, District | 993 | 390 | 39.2 | 110 | 11.1 | 264 | 26.6 | 229 | 23.1 |
| Leominster, District | 465 | 216 | 46.4 | 20 | 4.3 | 110 | 23.7 | 119 | 25.6 |
| Worcester, Western District | 432 | 71 | 16.4 | 13 | 3.1 | 295 | 68.3 | 53 | 12.2 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 178 | 28 | 15.7 | 11 | 6.2 | 58 | 32.6 | 81 | 45.5 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | 638 | 58 | 9.1 | 41 | 6.5 | 488 | 76.5 | 51 | 7.9 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | 723 | 83 | 11.5 | 30 | 4.1 | 468 | 64.7 | 142 | 19.6 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 442 | 173 | 39.1 | 15 | 3.4 | 244 | 55.2 | 10 | 2.3 |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | 401 | 55 | 13.7 | 5 | 1.3 | 231 | 57.6 | 110 | 27.4 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | 181 | 29 | 16.0 | 9 | 5.0 | 114 | 63.0 | 29 | 16.0 |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | 366 | 174 | 47.5 | 12 | 3.3 | 98 | 26.8 | 82 | 22.4 |
| Essex, Second District | 346 | 79 | 22.8 | 17 | 4.9 | 205 | 59.2 | 45 | 13.1 |
| Barnstable, First District | 497 | 129 | 25.9 | 26 | 5.3 | 326 | 65.6 | 16 | 3.2 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 185 | 53 | 28.7 | 4 | 2.2 | 48 | 25.9 | 80 | 43.2 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 289 | 21 | 7.3 | 16 | 5.5 | 204 | 70.6 | 48 | 16.6 |
| Natick, District | 281 | 82 | 29.2 | 26 | 9.3 | 81 | 28.8 | 92 | 32.7 |
| Lee, District | 215 | 11 | 5.1 | 17 | 7.9 | 162 | 75.4 | 25 | 11.6 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | 100 | 8 | 8.0 | 12 | 12.0 | 73 | 73.0 | 7 | 7.0 |
| Franklin, Eastern District | 55 | 3 | 5.4 | 5 | 9.1 | 39 | 70.9 | 8 | 14.6 |
| Essex, Third District | 154 | 38 | 24.7 | 6 | 3.9 | 65 | 42.2 | 45 | 29.2 |
| Winchendon, District | 124 | 32 | 25.8 | 7 | 5.6 | 62 | 50.0 | 23 | 18.6 |
| Dukes County, District | 43 | 10 | 23.3 | 4 | 9.3 | 17 | 39.5 | 12 | 27.9 |
| Williamstown, District | 47 | 10 | 21.3 | 3 | 6.4 | 29 | 61.7 | 5 | 10.6 |
| Nantucket, District | 93 | 9 | 2.1 | 2 | 9.7 | 58 | 62.4 | 24 | 25.8 |
| Total | 10,292 | 2,878 | 27.9 | 572 | 5.5 | 5,080 | 49.5 | 1,762 | 17.1 |
| Aggregate | 140,112 | 31,368 | 22.4 | 11,130 | 7.9 | 63,240 | 45.2 | 34,374 | 24.5 |

TABLE 8. — RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS
Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness)

| Courts | Persons Arrested for Drunkenness | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| | Arrests | Releases | Per Cent |
| <i>Superior</i> | | | |
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket | — | — | — |
| Berkshire | — | — | — |
| Essex | — | — | — |
| Franklin | — | — | — |
| Hampden | — | — | — |
| Hampshire | — | — | — |
| Middlesex | — | — | — |
| Norfolk | — | — | — |
| Plymouth | — | — | — |
| Suffolk | — | — | — |
| Worcester | — | — | — |
| Total | — | — | — |
| <i>Boston</i> | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | 18,209 | 12,247 | 67.2 |
| Boston, Juvenile | — | — | — |
| Brighton, Municipal | 674 | 273 | 40.5 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 2,889 | 360 | 12.4 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 1,161 | 544 | 46.8 |
| East Boston, District | 3,969 | 2,421 | 60.9 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 4,597 | 1,120 | 24.3 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 5,833 | 3,275 | 56.1 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 1,216 | 424 | 34.8 |
| Chelsea, District | 1,833 | 414 | 22.5 |
| Total | 40,381 | 21,078 | 52.1 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | 3,986 | 2,277 | 57.1 |
| Springfield, District | 1,895 | 700 | 36.8 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 1,766 | 324 | 18.3 |
| Bristol, Third District | 1,219 | 548 | 44.9 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 3,764 | 1,479 | 39.2 |
| Lowell, District | 2,197 | 1,052 | 47.8 |
| Bristol, Second District | 1,696 | 798 | 47.0 |
| Essex, Southern District | 1,806 | 689 | 38.1 |
| Lawrence, District | 1,937 | 1,311 | 67.6 |
| Total | 20,266 | 9,178 | 45.2 |
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Norfolk, East District | 1,415 | 340 | 24.0 |
| Somerville, District | 1,360 | 5 | .3 |
| Essex, First District | 855 | 481 | 56.2 |
| Brockton, District | 1,301 | 485 | 37.2 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 610 | 254 | 41.6 |
| Holyoke, District | 863 | 1 | .1 |
| Hampshire, District | 566 | 84 | 14.8 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 901 | 136 | 15.0 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 614 | 90 | 14.6 |
| Bristol, First District | 502 | 171 | 34.0 |
| Total | 8,987 | 2,047 | 22.7 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | 652 | 122 | 18.7 |
| Newton, District | 542 | 80 | 14.7 |
| Fitchburg, District | 781 | 132 | 16.9 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 484 | 171 | 35.3 |
| Franklin, District | 122 | 24 | 19.6 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 267 | 77 | 28.8 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 272 | 8 | 2.9 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | 200 | 28 | 14.0 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 558 | 2 | .3 |
| Chicopee, District | 426 | 4 | .9 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 279 | 19 | 6.7 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 262 | 19 | 7.2 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 479 | 165 | 34.4 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 192 | — | — |
| Middlesex, Central District | 282 | — | — |
| Total | 5,798 | 851 | 14.8 |

TABLE 8. — RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS — Concluded
Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness) — Concluded

| Courts | Persons Arrested for Drunkenness | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| | Arrests | Releases | Per Cent |
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | 120 | — | — |
| Hampden, Western District | 368 | 13 | 3.5 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | 357 | 260 | 72.8 |
| Marlborough, District | 201 | 26 | 12.9 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 163 | 25 | 15.3 |
| Newburyport, District | 183 | 37 | 20.2 |
| Plymouth, Third District | 125 | 51 | 40.8 |
| Peabody, District | 411 | 42 | 10.2 |
| Leominster, District | 263 | 3 | 1.1 |
| Worcester, Western District | 83 | 2 | 2.4 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 98 | 29 | 29.5 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | 102 | 2 | 1.9 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | 178 | 19 | 10.6 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 33 | — | — |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | 72 | 13 | 18.0 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | 59 | — | — |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | 95 | 28 | 29.4 |
| Essex, Second District | 70 | 27 | 38.5 |
| Barnstable, First District | 129 | 4 | 3.1 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 40 | 2 | 5.0 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 59 | 1 | 1.6 |
| Natick, District | 156 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Lee, District | 64 | 2 | 3.1 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | 49 | 19 | 38.7 |
| Franklin, Eastern District | 17 | 1 | 5.8 |
| Essex, Third District | 79 | — | — |
| Winchendon, District | 63 | 6 | 9.5 |
| Dukes County, District | 5 | 1 | 20.0 |
| Williamstown, District | 14 | — | — |
| Nantucket, District | 4 | — | — |
| Total | 3,660 | 621 | 16.9 |
| Aggregate | 79,092 | 33,775 | 42.7 |

TABLE 9. — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS
Collection of Moneys under Orders of the Court

| Courts | Restitution | Non-Support | Suspended Sentence and Court Expense | Miscellaneous | Total |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| <i>Superior</i> | | | | | |
| Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket | \$3,207 16 | \$17,803 80 | \$353 58 | — | \$21,364 54 |
| Berkshire | 52 00 | 826 00 | — | — | 878 00 |
| Essex | 3,410 25 | 52,673 30 | 199 69 | — | 56,283 24 |
| Franklin | — | 244 31 | — | — | 244 31 |
| Hampden | 328 50 | 3,921 75 | — | — | 4,250 25 |
| Hampshire | — | 1,728 04 | — | — | 1,728 04 |
| Middlesex | 14,885 72 | 77,106 76 | 3,654 92 | \$349 68 | 95,997 08 |
| Norfolk | 965 25 | 9,408 68 | 42 00 | — | 10,415 93 |
| Plymouth | 1,146 10 | 8,275 58 | 15 00 | 38 05 | 9,474 73 |
| Suffolk | 50,351 70 | 134,160 52 | 4,958 23 | — | 189,470 45 |
| Worcester | 4,173 33 | 10,572 90 | 445 24 | — | 15,191 47 |
| Total | \$78,520 01 | \$316,721 64 | \$9,668 66 | \$387 73 | \$405,298 04 |

TABLE 9 — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS — Continued
Collections of Moneys under Orders of the Court — Continued

| Courts | Restitution | Non-Support | Suspended Sentence and Court Expense | Miscellaneous | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| <i>Boston</i> | | | | | |
| Boston, Municipal | \$26,102 85 | \$111,366 77 | \$17,976 79 | \$3,989 40 | \$159,435 81 |
| Boston, Juvenile | 1,233 22 | 1,590 80 | 74 25 | — | 2,898 27 |
| Brighton, Municipal | 1,087 76 | 19,070 37 | 5,430 30 | — | 25,588 43 |
| Charlestown, Municipal | 3,246 46 | 21,175 04 | 2,303 25 | — | 26,724 75 |
| Dorchester, Municipal | 1,608 54 | 30,650 67 | 4,027 00 | — | 36,286 21 |
| East Boston, District | 915 55 | 13,443 91 | 20,009 00 | — | 34,368 46 |
| Roxbury, Municipal | 5,144 05 | 115,528 34 | 31,381 00 | — | 152,053 39 |
| South Boston, Municipal | 837 99 | 15,514 26 | 12,001 50 | — | 28,353 75 |
| West Roxbury, Municipal | 960 75 | 4,279 22 | 6,548 00 | — | 11,787 97 |
| Chelsea, District | 419 97 | 10,223 36 | 2,847 77 | — | 13,491 10 |
| Total | \$41,537 14 | \$342,842 74 | \$102,598 86 | \$3,989 40 | \$490,988 14 |
| <i>Over 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Worcester, Central District | \$1,201 37 | \$25,386 02 | \$2,491 50 | \$19 73 | \$29,098 62 |
| Springfield, District | 7,125 94 | 69,143 52 | 12,141 50 | 50 84 | 88,461 80 |
| Middlesex, First Eastern District | 2,457 34 | 29,422 05 | 25,090 29 | 93 61 | 57,063 29 |
| Bristol, Third District | 2,861 90 | 68,825 66 | 2,935 78 | 22 25 | 74,645 59 |
| Middlesex, Third Eastern District | 5,736 14 | 60,791 03 | 10,795 00 | — | 77,322 17 |
| Lowell, District | 1,250 44 | 38,611 87 | 5,450 14 | — | 45,312 45 |
| Bristol, Second District | 2,434 01 | 28,300 50 | 11,763 60 | — | 42,498 11 |
| Essex, Southern District | 2,478 91 | 54,081 45 | 23,454 85 | — | 80,015 21 |
| Lawrence, District | 1,814 25 | 22,986 42 | 820 00 | 14 56 | 25,635 23 |
| Total | \$27,360 30 | \$397,548 52 | \$94,942 66 | \$200 99 | \$520,052 47 |
| <i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Norfolk, East District | \$998 25 | \$23,784 75 | \$10,203 46 | — | \$34,986 46 |
| Somerville, District | 1,585 05 | 27,670 80 | 1,537 00 | — | 30,792 85 |
| Essex, First District | 1,505 14 | 37,480 90 | 3,605 60 | 63 22 | 42,654 86 |
| Brookton, District | 1,695 63 | 26,533 97 | 7,586 00 | — | 35,815 60 |
| Essex, Northern Central District | 253 25 | 6,933 50 | 60 00 | — | 7,246 75 |
| Holyoke, District | 219 70 | 18,803 03 | 2,143 00 | — | 21,165 73 |
| Hampshire, District | 643 30 | 12,841 76 | 8,649 80 | — | 22,134 86 |
| Middlesex, Second Eastern District | 987 94 | 12,549 50 | 7,093 00 | — | 20,630 44 |
| Berkshire, Central District | 504 71 | 13,429 68 | 1,955 06 | — | 15,889 45 |
| Bristol, First District | 530 75 | 8,556 25 | 1,519 00 | — | 10,606 00 |
| Total | \$8,923 72 | \$188,584 14 | \$44,351 92 | \$63 22 | \$241,923 00 |
| <i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District | \$647 50 | \$6,742 50 | \$7,075 13 | — | \$14,465 13 |
| Newton, District | 3,165 57 | 15,115 64 | 7,516 05 | — | 25,797 26 |
| Fitchburg, District | 388 49 | 8,929 40 | 6,405 00 | — | 15,722 89 |
| Norfolk, Northern District | 36 92 | 12,955 35 | 2,455 00 | — | 15,447 27 |
| Franklin, District | 412 00 | 3,463 00 | 2,983 00 | — | 6,858 00 |
| Worcester, First Southern District | 60 00 | 2,183 11 | — | — | 2,243 11 |
| Brookline, Municipal | 1,446 79 | 11,070 80 | 1,336 00 | — | 13,853 59 |
| Bristol, Fourth District | — | 4,005 00 | 718 00 | — | 4,723 00 |
| Plymouth, Second District | 1,360 00 | 5,637 00 | 4,810 00 | — | 11,807 00 |
| Chicopee, District | 313 05 | 3,704 26 | 248 00 | — | 4,265 31 |
| Worcester, First Northern District | 588 85 | 797 76 | 253 70 | — | 1,640 31 |
| Middlesex, First Southern District | 110 09 | 10,940 45 | 2,289 50 | — | 13,340 04 |
| Essex, Eastern District | 26 52 | 12,151 85 | 195 00 | — | 12,373 37 |
| Norfolk, Western District | 34 65 | 3,475 50 | — | — | 3,510 15 |
| Middlesex, Central District | 168 56 | 1,920 50 | 7,863 18 | — | 9,952 24 |
| Total | \$8,758 99 | \$103,092 12 | \$44,147 56 | — | \$155,998 67 |

TABLE 9 — COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS — Concluded
Collection of Moneys under Orders of the Court — Concluded

| Courts | Restitution | Non-Support | Suspended Sentence and Court Expense | Miscellaneous | Total |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>Under 25,000 Population</i> | | | | | |
| Worcester, Second Southern District | — | \$412 00 | \$186 00 | — | \$598 00 |
| Hampden, Western District | — | 2,194 25 | 5,006 00 | — | 7,200 25 |
| Berkshire, Northern District | \$12 00 | 3,525 13 | — | — | 3,537 13 |
| Marlborough, District | 189 50 | 3,682 60 | 817 00 | — | 4,689 10 |
| Worcester, Second Eastern District | 68 00 | 1,125 22 | — | — | 1,193 22 |
| Newburyport, District | 89 88 | 3,445 53 | 2,491 25 | — | 6,026 66 |
| Plymouth, Third District | 169 48 | 528 00 | 1,995 29 | — | 2,692 77 |
| Peabody, District | 1,693 62 | 5,756 25 | 3,974 00 | — | 11,423 87 |
| Leominster, District | 38 50 | 2,701 88 | 3,717 00 | \$4 43 | 6,461 81 |
| Worcester, Western District | 40 00 | 342 00 | 313 00 | — | 695 00 |
| Worcester, Third Southern District | 60 00 | 2,146 00 | 100 00 | — | 2,306 00 |
| Hampden, Eastern District | 85 00 | 1,567 14 | 729 00 | — | 2,381 14 |
| Plymouth, Fourth District | — | 3,974 50 | 2,420 00 | — | 6,394 50 |
| Norfolk, Southern District | 115 50 | 265 00 | 2,473 00 | — | 2,853 50 |
| Middlesex, First Northern District | 11 75 | 612 00 | 1,450 00 | — | 2,073 75 |
| Worcester, First Eastern District | — | 337 00 | 1,118 00 | — | 1,455 00 |
| Berkshire, Fourth District | 10 00 | 381 00 | — | — | 391 00 |
| Essex, Second District | 28 60 | 1,821 25 | 1,531 00 | — | 3,380 85 |
| Barnstable, First District | 331 80 | 3,907 73 | 647 34 | — | 4,886 87 |
| Barnstable, Second District | 10 00 | 5,296 00 | — | 460 00 | 5,766 00 |
| Berkshire, Southern District | 27 00 | 3,626 00 | 637 00 | — | 4,290 00 |
| Natick, District | 203 50 | 2,124 00 | 1,155 00 | — | 3,482 50 |
| Lee, District | — | 1,757 64 | — | — | 1,757 64 |
| Hampshire, Eastern District | — | — | — | — | — |
| Franklin, Eastern District | — | 132 00 | — | — | 132 00 |
| Essex, Third District | 180 81 | 1,080 25 | 535 00 | — | 1,796 06 |
| Winchendon, District | — | 979 00 | 255 00 | — | 1,234 00 |
| Dukes County, District | — | 120 00 | — | — | 120 00 |
| Williamstown, District | — | 680 00 | — | — | 680 00 |
| Nantucket, District | — | — | — | — | — |
| Total | \$3,364 94 | \$54,519 37 | \$31,549 88 | \$464 43 | \$89,898 62 |
| Aggregate | \$168,485 10 | \$1,403,308 53 | \$327,259 54 | \$5,105 77 | \$1,904,158 94 |

TABLE 10. — COST OF PROBATION IN ALL COURTS, YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1927

| Counties | Salaries | Pro Tem. Officers | Clerical Assistance | Expense | Total |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Barnstable | \$2,280 04 | — | \$100 00 | \$457 11 | \$2,837 15 |
| Berkshire | 5,453 00 | \$221 33 | 975 00 | 743 41 | 7,392 74 |
| Bristol | 13,955 00 | 623 16 | 3,347 28 | 2,012 63 | 19,938 07 |
| Dukes | 82 50 | — | — | — | 82 50 |
| Essex | 29,355 56 | 973 59 | 6,761 67 | 1,800 23 | 38,891 05 |
| Franklin | 1,770 00 | — | — | 125 57 | 1,895 57 |
| Hampden | 18,275 70 | 399 99 | 6,541 56 | 1,243 52 | 26,460 77 |
| Hampshire | 2,713 99 | 177 60 | 1,272 00 | 95 18 | 4,258 77 |
| Middlesex | 55,041 64 | 1,364 13 | 11,160 62 | 3,311 61 | 70,878 00 |
| Nantucket | 526 98 | — | — | — | 526 98 |
| Norfolk | 14,809 71 | 801 51 | 2,045 72 | 1,239 36 | 18,896 30 |
| Plymouth | 7,614 50 | 381 71 | 2,015 86 | 1,198 60 | 11,210 67 |
| Suffolk | 176,937 94 | — | 50,340 18 | 5,614 58 | 232,892 70 |
| Worcester | 20,623 66 | 1,080 35 | 3,449 14 | 1,764 84 | 26,917 99 |
| Total | \$349,440 22 | \$6,023 37 | \$88,009 03 | \$19,606 64 | \$463,079 26 |
| Commission on Probation | 7,400 00 | — | 21,291 91 | 6,400 00 | 35,091 91 |
| Aggregate | \$356,840 22 | \$6,023 37 | \$109,300 94 | \$26,006 64 | \$498,171 17 |

